IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Karine VALLE et al.

Application No.: 10/542,813 Group Art Unit: 1795

Filing Date or 371(c) Date: July 20, 2005 Examiner: Adam A. Arciero

Title: Conductive Organic-inorganic Hybrid Confirmation No.: 8622

Material Comprising a Mesoporous Phase, Membrane, Electrode and Fuel

Cell

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In complete response to the Restriction Requirement mailed March 18, 2009, Applicants provisionally elect Group I, represented by claims 29-46 and 57-58, drawn to a conductive organic-inorganic hybrid material, for prosecution in the present application. The provisional election is made *with traverse*. Applicants reserve the right to file divisional application(s) based on the non-elected claims.

As set forth in the Administrative Instructions under the PCT published in the PCT Gazette S-03/2001 (August 30, 2001):

- (e) Combinations of Different Categories of Claims. The method for determining unity of invention under Rule 13 shall be construed as permitting, in particular, the inclusion of any one of the following combinations of claims of different categories in the same international application:
- (i) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for a use of the said product...

(Emphasis added). In addition, PCT Gazette S-03/2001 provides illustrative examples providing guidance for making a determination of unity of invention in particular cases. These examples are provided in the attached Exhibit 1. The relationship between the claims of Groups I, II, and III in the instant application is the same as the relationship between

Attorney Docket No. 13777-46
Page 2 of 2

Application No.: 10/542,813 Response to Restriction filed: May 15, 2009 Restriction Requirement dated: March 18, 2009

claims 1, 2, and 3 of Example 1, which claims are considered to have unity of invention. In the present application, Group I, claims 29-46 and 57-58, are directed to the product, i.e., a conductive organic-inorganic hybrid material; Group II, claim 47, is directed to a use of the product, i.e., a fuel cell comprising a conductive organic-inorganic hybrid material; and Group III, claims 48-56 and 60-62, are directed to a process for manufacturing the product, i.e., a process for preparing a conductive organic-inorganic hybrid material. The common technical feature is the conductive organic-inorganic hybrid material. Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that pursuant PCT Rule 13, the claims of the instant application have unity of invention. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Requirement for Restriction.

Although it is believed that no fee is necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-1925.

If any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

allem B. Mesles

Registration No. 56,745

Date: May 15, 2009

2801 Slater Road, Suite 120 Morrisville, NC 27560-8477

Phone: 919.481.1111

- (j) Rule 13.3 is not intended to constitute an encouragement to the use of alternatives within a single claim, but is intended to clarify that the criterion for the determination of unity of invention (namely, the method contained in Rule 13.2) remains the same regardless of the form of claim used.
- (k) Rule 13.3 does not prevent an International Searching or Preliminary Examining Authority or an Office from objecting to alternatives being contained within a single claim on the basis of considerations such as clarity, the conciseness of claims or the claims fee system applicable in that Authority or Office.

Part 2 Examples Concerning Unity of Invention

The application of the principles of unity of invention is illustrated by the following examples for guidance in particular cases.

I. Claims in Different Categories

Example 1

Claim 1: A method of manufacturing chemical substance X.

Claim 2: Substance X.

Claim 3: The use of substance X as an insecticide.

Unity exists between claims 1, 2 and 3. The special technical feature common to all the claims is substance X.

Example 2

Claim 1: A process of manufacture comprising steps A and B.

Claim 2: Apparatus specifically designed for carrying out step A.

Claim 3: Apparatus specifically designed for carrying out step B.

Unity exists between claims 1 and 2 or between claims 1 and 3. There is no unity between claims 2 and 3 since there exists no common special technical feature between the two claims.

Example 3

Claim 1: A process for painting an article in which the paint contains a new rust inhibiting substance X including the steps of atomizing the paint using compressed air, electrostatically charging the atomized paint using a novel electrode arrangement A and directing the paint to the article.

Claim 2: A paint containing substance X.

Claim 3: An apparatus including electrode arrangement A.

Unity exists between claims 1 and 2 where the common special technical feature is the paint containing substance X or between claims 1 and 3 where the common special technical feature is the electrode arrangement A.

However, unity is lacking between claims 2 and 3 since there exists no common special technical feature between them.

Exhibit 1

Example 4

- Claim 1: Use of a family of compounds X as insecticides.
- Claim 2: Compound X_1 belonging to family X.

Provided X_1 has the insecticidal activity and the special technical feature in claim 1 is the insecticidal use, unity is present.

Example 5

- Claim 1: A process for treating textiles comprising spraying the material with a particular coating composition under special conditions (e.g., as to temperature, irradiation).
- Claim 2: A textile material coated according to the process of claim 1.
- Claim 3: A spraying machine for use in the process of claim 1 and characterized by a new nozzle arrangement providing a better distribution of the composition being sprayed.

The process according to claim 1 imparts unexpected properties to the product of claim 2.

The special technical feature in claim 1 is the use of special process conditions corresponding to what is made necessary by the choice of the particular coating. Unity exists between claims 1 and 2.

The spraying machine in claim 3 does not correspond to the above identified special technical feature. Unity does not exist between claim 3 and claims 1 and 2.

Example 6

- Claim 1: A fuel burner with tangential fuel inlets into a mixing chamber.
- Claim 2: A process for making a fuel burner including the step of forming tangential fuel inlets into a mixing chamber.
- Claim 3: A process for making a fuel burner including casting step A.
- Claim 4: An apparatus for carrying out a process for making a fuel burner including feature X resulting in the formation of tangential fuel inlets.
- Claim 5: An apparatus for carrying out a process for making a fuel burner including a protective housing B.
- Claim 6: A process of manufacturing carbon black including the step of tangentially introducing fuel into a mixing chamber of a fuel burner.

Unity exists between claims 1, 2, 4 and 6. The special technical feature common to all the claims is the tangential fuel inlets. Claims 3 and 5 lack unity with claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 since claims 3 and 5 do not include the same or corresponding special technical feature as set forth in claims 1, 2, 4 and 6. Claims 3 and 5 would also lack unity with one another.

Example 7

- Claim 1: A high corrosion resistant and high strength ferritic stainless steel strip consisting essentially of, in percent by weight: Ni=2.0-5.0; Cr=15-19; Mo=1-2; and the balance Fe having a thickness of between 0.5 and 2.0 mm and a 0.2% yield strength in excess of 50 kg/mm squared.
- Claim 2: A method of producing a high corrosion resistant and high strength ferritic stainless steel strip consisting essentially of, in percent by weight: Ni=2.0-5.0; Cr=15-19; Mo=1-2; and the balance Fe, comprising the steps of:

Exhibit 1

hot rolling to a thickness between 2.0 and 5.0 mm;

annealing the hot rolled strip at 800-1000 degrees C under substantially non-oxidizing conditions;

cold rolling the strip to a thickness of between 0.5 and 2.0 mm; and final annealing the cold rolled strip at between 1120 and 1200 degrees C for a period of 2-5 minutes.

Unity exists between product claim 1 and process claim 2. The special technical feature in the product claim is the 0.2% yield strength in excess of 50 kg/mm squared. The process steps in claim 2 inherently produce a ferritic stainless steel strip with a 0.2% yield strength in excess of 50 kg/mm squared. Even if this feature is not apparent from the wording of claim 2, it is clearly disclosed in the description. Therefore said process steps are the special technical feature which correspond to the limitation in the product claim directed to the same ferritic stainless steel with the claimed strength characteristics.

II. Claims in the Same Category

Example 8

Claim 1: Plug characterized by feature A.

Claim 2: Socket characterized by corresponding feature A.

Feature A is a special technical feature which is included in both claims 1 and 2 and therefore unity is present.

Example 9

Claim 1: Transmitter provided with time axis expander for video signals.

Claim 2: Receiver provided with time axis compressor for video signals received.

Claim 3: Transmission equipment for video signals comprising a transmitter provided with time axis expander for video signals and a receiver provided with time axis compressor for video signals received.

The special technical features are in claim 1 the time axis expander, and in claim 2 the time axis compressor, which are corresponding technical features. Unity exists between claims 1 and 2. Claim 3 includes both special technical features and has unity with claims 1 and 2. The requirement for unity would still be met in the absence of the combination claim (claim 3).

Example 10

Claim 1: Conveyor belt with feature A.

Claim 2: Conveyor belt with feature B.

Claim 3: Conveyor belt with features A + B.

Feature A is a special technical feature and feature B is another unrelated special technical feature. Unity exists between claims 1 and 3 or between claims 2 and 3, but not between claims 1 and 2.

Example 11

Claim 1: Control circuit A for a d.c. motor.

Claim 2: Control circuit B for a d.c. motor.

Claim 3: An apparatus including a d.c. motor with control circuit A.

Claim 4: An apparatus including a d.c. motor with control circuit B.

Exhibit 1